specification, the Examiner remains unpersuaded that the claims in this case are definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2. Applicants offer the following additional discussion to demonstrate that these claims would be readily understandable when read in light of the specification by one skilled in the art. In particular, Applicants submit that the subject matter relating to Figure 2 provides an adequate basis for concluding that the claims are definite in view of the specification. With respect to the term "transmission function", this is not a device having an input and output, but rather a mathematical description of a signal pattern, as is sufficiently known to one skilled in the art of signal processing. As such, to speak of these abstract functions as having physical "inputs" as suggested by the Examiner is, respectfully, a mischaracterization of the present invention as recited in the claims. Moreover, it is also a misapprehension of the true nature of the term "transmission function"to characterize the recited signal segments as elements that may somehow be physically "fed' into an "overall transmission function". Instead, the total transmission function meant by this is produced by simply adding partial transmission functions of the individual signal elements. A person of ordinary skill in the art reading the specification would realize how the crash signals are generated synthetically. Therefore, with all due respect, the lack of clarity that the Examiner sees in the claims is due not to the actual language of the claims, but to the manner in which the Examiner has chosen to describe the concepts expressed by the claim language. When these "transmission functions" are viewed as they are intended by the specification to be viewed, that is, as mathematical functions to which the physical acts of "feeding" signals thereto and possessing "inputs" and "outputs" have no relevance, it is respectfully submitted that the claims can be viewed as complying completely with 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2. Therefore, in view of this discussion, Applicants respectfully submit withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,345,402 to Gioutsos et al. ("Gioutsos"). Applicants submit that none of claims 1-3 is anticipated by Gioutsos. In the case of Gioutsos, various synthetic crash signals are generated by multiplying a crash signal having different wave shapes, produced by a "white noise generator". Unlike the invention of claim 1, Gioutsos does not show an actual crash signal that is split up into a plurality of successive signal segments. In Gioutsos, it is certainly not the case that the individual signal segments are simulated by transmission

functions, which, in the final analysis, are recombined to form a total transmission function, so that by changing the parameters of the total transmission function, new crash signals can be generated. Therefore, because of these deficiencies in Gioutsos, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The present invention is new, non-obvious, and useful. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

By: Dan Bright (Reg. No. 41,172)

Dated: 1/24/00

By: Richard L. Mayer
Richard L. Mayer
Registration No. 22,490

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
Telephone: (212) 425-7200

251474